REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated September 21, 2005, claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Brown* (6,263,261).

Claim 1 recites a rollover control system for an automotive vehicle and includes an active suspension having an independently adjustable unloading side and an independently adjustable loading side. Rollover sensor generates a rollover signal in response to an imminent rollover of a vehicle. A controller is coupled to the rollover sensor for controlling an active suspension to generate a restoring torque in response to the rollover signal.

Claim 1 includes an active suspension and a controller that controls the active suspension to generate a restoring torque in response to the rollover signal. The *Brown* reference is a rollover control system that, as shown in Figs. 9, 10 and 11, use brake force distribution and/or steering to prevent rollover. Applicants admit that automotive vehicles include suspensions. However, Claim 1 recites an active suspension having an independently adjustable unloading side and an independently adjustable loading side. The Examiner cites various sensors such as sensing the force or torque associated with a loading condition. The sensors sense the condition of the suspension but do not make the suspension an active suspension. An active suspension is a controllable suspension and in this case, Claim 1 recites that the active suspension has an independently adjustable unloading and an independently adjustable loading side. It is the suspension that is used to generate a restoring torque in response to the rollover signal. The Examiner states "inherently Brown teaches an active suspension system" at the bottom of page 3. However, active suspensions are not very common in vehicles and no teaching or suggestion is found for an active suspension to generate a restoring torque in response to the rollover signal. Typically, suspensions such as those set forth in the *Brown* reference are passive (not controllable). Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of Claim 1. Likewise, Claims 2-11 are dependent upon Claim 1.

Claim 12 recites a method for controlling stability of a vehicle having an active suspension. The last step of Claim 12 recites generating a restoring torque in response to the rollover signal by controlling the active suspension. Applicants respectfully submit that this is not taught or suggested as mentioned above with respect to Claim 1.

Claims 13-18 depend upon Claim 12 and are also allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 18 is an independent claim and also recites controlling the suspension by generating a restoring torque in response to the steps of unloading and loading to counter the imminent rollover. Applicants respectfully submit that this also is not taught or suggested in the *Brown* reference.

Claims 19-22 depend from Claim 18 and are thus also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants believe that all rejections are now overcome. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments which would place the application in better condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin G. Mierzwa
Registration No. 38,049
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 12/20/05

Artz & Artz, P.C.
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, Michigan 48034
(248) 223-9500